arXiv:1611.07506v1 [math.AC] 22 Nov 2016

Bounding the degrees of a minimal μ-basis for a rational surface parametrization.

Yairon Cid Ruiz*

Department de Matemàtiques i Informàtica, Facultat de Matemàtiques, Universitat de Barcelona, Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585; 08007 Spain.

Abstract

For an arbitrary rational surface parametrization $P(s,t) = (a(s,t), b(s,t), c(s,t), d(s,t)) \in \mathbb{F}[s,t]^4$ over an infinite field $\mathbb{F}$, we show the existence of a μ-basis with polynomials bounded in degree by $O(\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))^{33})$.

Our proof depends on obtaining a homogeneous ideal in $\mathbb{F}[s,t,u]$ by homogenizing a, b, c, d. Making additional assumptions on this homogeneous ideal we can obtain lower bounds:

- If the projective dimension of this homogeneous ideal is one, then the bound for the μ-basis is $\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))$.
- If this homogeneous ideal has height three, then the bound for the μ-basis is in the order of $O(\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))^{22})$
- When this homogeneous ideal is a general Artinian almost complete intersection, then the bound for the μ-basis is in the order of $O(\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))^{12})$.

Keywords: Syzygies, μ-basis, Koszul complex, Hilbert Syzygy Theorem, Quillen-Suslin Theorem, unimodular matrix, liaison, Euler characteristic.

1 Introduction

In [5] it is proven that any *rational parametric surface* has a *μ-basis*. That strong result geometrically means that any *rational surface* is the intersection of *three moving planes*.

* *E-mail address:* ycid@ub.edu.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 13D02; Secondary 14Q05.

Definition 1. *A rational surface parametrization in homogeneous form is defined by*

$$P(s,t) = (a(s,t), b(s,t), c(s,t), d(s,t)) \tag{1}$$

where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{F}[s,t]$ *and* $\gcd(a,b,c,d) = 1$.

Definition 2. *A moving plane following the rational parametrization (1) is a quadruple* $(A(s,t), B(s,t), C(s,t), D(s,t)) \in \mathbb{F}[s,t]^4$ *such that*

$$A(s,t)a(s,t) + B(s,t)b(s,t) + C(s,t)c(s,t) + D(s,t)d(s,t) = 0 \tag{2}$$

for all $s, t \in \mathbb{F}$.

We denote the collection of moving planes of the rational parametrization $P(s,t)$ as $L_{s,t} \subset \mathbb{F}[s,t]^4$. From the previous definition we see that the collection $L_{s,t}$ is equal to the *0-th syzygy* K_0 of the $\mathbb{F}[s,t]$-module(ideal) generated by the polynomials $\{a(s,t), b(s,t), c(s,t), d(s,t)\}$, that is $I = (a,b,c,d) \subset \mathbb{F}[s,t]$. Hence we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to K_0 (= L_{s,t}) \to \mathbb{F}[s,t]^4 \xrightarrow{[a,b,c,d]} I \to 0. \tag{3}$$

In [5] the notation $\mathrm{Syz}(a,b,c,d)$ is used for the *0-th syzygy* K_0, which seems appropriate now to use because we want to stress that the previous exact sequence depends on the generators $\{a,b,c,d\}$.

Definition 3. *Let* $\mathbf{p} = (p_1,p_2,p_3,p_4), \mathbf{q} = (q_1,q_2,q_3,q_4), \mathbf{r} = (r_1,r_2,r_3,r_4) \in L_{s,t} (= K_0 = Syz(a,b,c,d))$ *be three moving planes such that*

$$[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}] = \alpha P(s,t) \tag{4}$$

for some nonzero constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$. *Then* $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}$ *are said to be a* $\mu -$ **basis** *of the rational surface parametrization (1). Here* $[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}]$ *is defined as the outer product*

$$[\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}] = \left(\begin{vmatrix} p_2 & p_3 & p_4 \\ q_2 & q_3 & q_4 \\ r_2 & r_3 & r_4 \end{vmatrix}, - \begin{vmatrix} p_1 & p_3 & p_4 \\ q_1 & q_3 & q_4 \\ r_1 & r_3 & r_4 \end{vmatrix}, \begin{vmatrix} p_1 & p_2 & p_4 \\ q_1 & q_2 & q_4 \\ r_1 & r_2 & r_4 \end{vmatrix}, - \begin{vmatrix} p_1 & p_1 & p_3 \\ q_1 & q_2 & q_3 \\ r_1 & r_2 & r_3 \end{vmatrix} \right).$$

The previous condition means that the rational parametrization $P(s,t)$ can be represented as the intersection of three moving planes $\mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{r}$ without extraneous factors.

An important fact is that the zero syzygy $\mathrm{Syz}(a,b,c,d)$ is actually a free module of rank 3. Surprisingly enough, there is a $1-1$ relation between a μ-basis and a basis for the syzygy module $\mathrm{Syz}(a,b,c,d)$ given in the following form:

- [5, Corollary 3.1] $\mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{r}$ form an μ-basis if and only if $\mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{r}$ are a basis of $\mathrm{Syz}(a, b, c, d)$.

Definition 4. $\mathbf{p}$, $\mathbf{q}$ *and* $\mathbf{r}$ *are said to form a* ***minimal*** μ***-basis*** *of the rational surface (1) if among all the triples satisfying (4),* $\deg(\mathbf{p}) + \deg(\mathbf{q}) + \deg(\mathbf{r})$ *is the smallest. Here,* deg *denotes the total degree in the variables* s *and* t*.*

In [5] there are left several questions of interest for further research and better understanding. Here we try to address the question:

- **What can be said about the degrees of the polynomials in a minimal μ-basis?**

Our approach will be to prove the existence of a basis for the syzygy module $\mathrm{Syz}(a, b, c, d)$, where the polynomials in this basis are bounded in terms of the maximal degree $\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))$.

Notation 5. *In this paper* $\mathbb{K}$ *will always denote an arbitrary field and* $\mathbb{F}$ *an infinite field. We have tried to achieve our results as general as possible, but for an "effective" application of the Quillen-Suslin Theorem from* [3] *we need to work over an infinite field.*

The main results obtained in this paper are:

(i) For any rational parametrization $P(s, t)$ as in (1), we prove in Theorem 29 that there exists a μ-basis $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r}$ with polynomial entries bounded in the order of

$$O(\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))^{33}).$$

Our proof depends in great deal from obtaining a homogeneous ideal inside $\mathbb{F}[s, t, u]$ by homogenizing the generators a, b, c, d. Assuming that this obtained homogeneous ideal has additional properties we can get lower bounds:

(ii) When this homogeneous ideal has projective dimension one, in Theorem 24 we prove the existence of a μ-basis with polynomials bounded by $\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))$.

(iii) If this homogeneous ideal has height three, then in Theorem 29 we prove that a μ-basis bounded by $O(\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))^{22})$ exists.

(iv) If this homogeneous ideal is generated by "general" polynomials (i.e. it is a general Artinian almost complete intersection as in Remark 23), then in Theorem 29 the bound can be improved until $O(\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))^{12})$.

To proceed with our proof we needed to find some numerical bounds for this homogeneous ideal:

(v) For a homogeneous ideal $I = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) \subset \mathbb{K}[s, t, u]$ generated by m relatively prime

polynomials in $\mathbb{K}[s,t,u]$, in Theorem 13 we give bounds for the regularity and the Betti numbers.

(vi) For a homogeneous ideal $I = (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4) \subset \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]$ with $\deg(g_1) = \ldots = \deg(g_4)$ and $\mathrm{ht}(I) = 3$, in Theorem 20 we improve the bounds for the Betti numbers.

2 Dealing with syzygies

Proving that $\mathrm{Syz}(a,b,c,d)$ is a free module of rank 3, it is an important step in [5] to show the existence of a μ-basis. In this section we give a different proof for that statement, which we also generalize because we will need the case of three variables after homogenizing the ideal $I = (a,b,c,d)$.

Theorem 6. *Let I be an ideal in $R = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, with $n \geq 2$. Then, for any projective resolution of I composed of finitely generated modules, the corresponding (n-2)-th syzygy K_{n-2} is free.*

Proof. Let $\ldots \xrightarrow{d_n} P_{n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n-1}} P_{n-2} \xrightarrow{d_{n-2}} P_{n-3} \xrightarrow{d_{n-3}} \ldots \xrightarrow{d_1} P_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} I \to 0$ be a projective resolution of I where each P_i is a finitely generated projective module. From the Quillen-Suslin Theorem we know that in this case the modules P_i are actually free.

By the Hilbert Syzygy Theorem, there exists a free resolution of length at most n for the quotient ring R/I. We assume that it has length n and we denote it by

$$0 \to F_n \to F_{n-1} \to \ldots \to F_0 \to R/I \to 0,$$

because if it has length smaller than n then we can simply fill it with zero modules.

With the given projective resolution of I we get the exact sequence

$$0 \to K_{n-2} \to P_{n-2} \xrightarrow{d_{n-2}} P_{n-3} \xrightarrow{d_{n-3}} \ldots \xrightarrow{d_1} P_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} R \to R/I \to 0,$$

where $K_{n-2} = \mathrm{Ker}(d_{n-2})$ is the (n-2)-th syzygy. Then, from the generalized Schanuel Lemma (see [11, Theorem 189]) we have the isomorphism

$$K_{n-2} \oplus F_{n-1} \oplus \ldots \cong F_n \oplus P_{n-2} \oplus \ldots,$$

which implies that K_{n-2} is a projective module. Since R is Noetherian and P_{n-2} is finitely generated, then P_{n-2} is Noetherian and $K_{n-2} \subset P_{n-2}$ is finitely generated. Finally, the Quillen-Suslin Theorem implies that the module K_{n-2} is free. ■

Corollary 7. *For any ideal $I \subset \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ we have $pd(I) \leq n-1$.*

Proof. Using that $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is Noetherian, for the ideal I we can always find a free resolution composed of finitely generated modules. So the corollary follows immediately from Theorem 6. ■

We finish this section by proving that the free module $\mathrm{Syz}(a, b, c, d)$ has rank 3. The main tool for this step will be the *Euler characteristic* (see [11, Section 4.3]).

Lemma 8. *Let A be a Noetherian ring, and $I \subset A$ be a nonzero ideal with a finite free resolution. Then $\chi(I) = 1$.*

Proof. *Step 1.*[1] Let $0 \to L \to M \to N \to 0$ be a short exact sequence of A-modules with finite free resolution, then $\chi(M) = \chi(L) + \chi(N)$. A proof of this fact follows from the Horseshoe Lemma (see [17, Lemma 6.20]).

Step 2.[2] From the exact sequence $0 \to I \to A \to A/I \to 0$ and the previous step, we obtain $\chi(A) = \chi(I) + \chi(A/I)$. We always have $\chi(A) = 1$ and from [11, Theorem 195] we get $\chi(A/I) = 0$. Therefore $\chi(I) = 1$. ■

From the Hilbert Syzygy Theorem we know that any finitely generated module over the polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ has a finite free resolution, so we are free to apply the previous Lemma 8 in this case.

Corollary 9. *Let $I = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m)$ be an ideal in $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ with $pd(I) = 1$. Then $Syz(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m)$ is a free module of rank $m - 1$.*

Proof. From a small variation of Theorem 6 we know that $\mathrm{Syz}(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m)$ is a free module when $\mathrm{pd}(I) = 1$, then

$$0 \to \mathrm{Syz}(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) \to \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]^m \xrightarrow{[f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m]} I \to 0$$

is a finite free resolution for I.

Therefore $1 = \chi(I) = m - \mathrm{rank}(\mathrm{Syz}(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m))$, and so

$$\mathrm{rank}(\mathrm{Syz}(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m)) = m - 1.$$

■

[1] [11, Exercise 1, Section 4.3].
[2] [11, Exercise 2, Section 4.3].

3 The outline of our proof

In this section we describe how we will prove the existence of a basis with a certain bound in terms of $\max(\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c), \deg(d))$. For notational purposes from now on, we assume that $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \in \mathbb{F}[s,t]$ are the polynomials defining the rational surface (1) and that $d = \max_{1\leq i\leq 4}(\deg(a_i))$. Therefore we will try to solve the following problem for the rest of this document:

- Given the polynomials $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$, with $d = \max_{1\leq i\leq 4}(\deg(a_i))$ and $\gcd(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = 1$. Find a basis of $\mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ with polynomials bounded in degree by certain formula in terms of d.

For us is not clear at all how to define a bound in the "degree of the polynomials" if we are working with modules over the polynomial ring $\mathbb{F}[s,t]$. Instead we will try to reduce the problem to a graded case where we can exploit the structure of the grading.

Given the data $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ that defines (1), then we define the homogeneous ideal $\hat{I} = (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$ with

$$b_i(s,t,u) = u^d a_i(\frac{s}{u}, \frac{t}{u}) \in \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]. \tag{5}$$

For the ideal $\hat{I} \subset \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]$ we can compute a graded free resolution starting with

$$\ldots \to \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0,$$

and continuing until

$$0 \to K_1 \to F_1 \to \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0.$$

From Theorem 6 we know that the first syzygy K_1 is a free $\mathbb{F}[s,t,u]$-module. Therefore we can assure that the ideal $\hat{I}$ has a graded free resolution of the form

$$0 \to \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]^a \to \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]^b \to \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0. \tag{6}$$

Intuitively, we could expect that if we make the substitution $u = 1$ in the previous resolution, we will find a free resolution (perhaps no longer graded) of the ideal $I = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$. Fortunately this hunch turns out to be true, for a proof of this fact see [9, Corollary 19.8] or [1, Proposition 1.1.5].

Finding a resolution like in (6) with a certain bound in the degree of the polynomials involved in the differential maps, will give us a resolution of I in the form

$$0 \to \mathbb{F}[s,t]^a \to \mathbb{F}[s,t]^b \to \mathbb{F}[s,t]^4 \xrightarrow{[a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4]} I \to 0,$$

with the same bound.

From now on we shall use the notations $S = \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]$ and $R = \mathbb{F}[s,t] \cong S/(u-1)$. There are two possible cases of (6) that we have to analyze:

(I) If $\mathrm{pd}_S(\hat{I}) = 1$ then the resolution (6) is of the form

$$0 \to S^a \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1}} S^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0, \tag{7}$$

where we can conclude that $a = 3$ as previously stated in Corollary 9. By tensoring with $\otimes_S R$ we obtain the free resolution

$$0 \to R^3 \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1}\otimes_S R} R^4 \xrightarrow{[a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4]} I \to 0.$$

So we know that $\hat{d_1} \otimes_S R \in R^{4\times 3}$ is a 4×3 matrix with entries in R and the columns of $\hat{d_1} \otimes_S R$ encode a basis of $\mathrm{Syz}(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4)$ as a submodule of R^4. If we find a bound for the polynomials in the entries of the matrix $\hat{d_1} \in S^{4\times 3}$, then we will get automatically a bound for the degree of the polynomials in a basis of $\mathrm{Syz}(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4)$ and our proof will be completed for this case.

(II) If $\mathrm{pd}_S(\hat{I}) = 2$ then the resolution (6) is of the form

$$0 \to S^a \xrightarrow{\hat{d_2}} S^b \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1}} S^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0, \tag{8}$$

and using $1 = \chi(\hat{I}) = 4 - b + a$ we conclude that $b = a + 3$. Again by tensoring with $\otimes_S R$ we can obtain the free resolution

$$0 \to R^a \xrightarrow{\hat{d_2}\otimes_S R} R^{a+3} \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1}\otimes_S R} R^4 \xrightarrow{[a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4]} I \to 0.$$

The main goal of this paper is to study this more complicated case, and to show the existence of a μ-basis with degree bounded by

$$O(\max(\deg(a),\deg(b),\deg(c),\deg(d))^{33}).$$

Also we shall show that adding some additional hypothesis we can get lower bounds.

Using a computer algebra system like Singular [7] we can easily compute various examples for the two previous cases.

Example 10. *Let* $P(s,t) = (s^2, t^2, s^2 - t^2, s^2 + t^2)$*, then* $pd_S(\hat{I}) = 1$ *and we get the following*

free resolution

$$0 \to S^3 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & -t^2 \\ 1 & -2 & s^2 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} S^4 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} s^2 & t^2 & s^2-t^2 & s^2+t^2 \end{pmatrix}} \hat{I} \to 0.$$

Example 11. *Let $P(s,t) = (s^2, t^2, s^2-1, s^2+1)$, then $pd_S(\hat{I}) = 2$ and we get the following free resolution*

$$0 \to S \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s^2 \\ -u^2 \\ -t^2 \end{pmatrix}} S^4 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -2 & -t^2 & -t^2 & u^2-s^2 \\ 0 & u^2 & s^2 & 0 \\ 1 & t^2 & 0 & s^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} S^4 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} s^2 & t^2 & s^2-u^2 & s^2+u^2 \end{pmatrix}} \hat{I} \to 0.$$

4 Bounds for the regularity and the Betti numbers

This section will be devoted to find a bound for the regularity and the Betti numbers of $\hat{I}$. Our main reference will be the chapter *"Graded Free Resolutions"* of [15].

Lemma 12. *For the ideal $\hat{I} = (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$ constructed in (5) we have that b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 are relatively prime (i.e.* $\gcd(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) = 1$*).*

Proof. From the hypothesis $\gcd(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = 1$ we can conclude that $\gcd(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) = 1$. By contradiction suppose that $g \in \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]$ is a non-constant polynomial with $g \mid b_i$, then we conclude that g is a polynomial that depends only on the variable u because $g(s,t,1)$ is a common divisor for the polynomials a_i. From the construction (5) we know that one of the polynomials b_i has a term that is free of u, without loss of generality we assume that $b_1(s,t,u) = \lambda s^\alpha t^{d-\alpha} + up(s,t,u)$ with $p \in \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]$. Then for some $h \in \mathbb{F}[s,t,u]$ we have $b_1(s,t,u) = g(u)h(s,t,u)$ and thus h has a term of the form $\beta s^\alpha t^{d-\alpha}$ that multiplied with the highest power of u in g gives a term of degree larger than d which cannot be reduced, and this contradicts the fact that b_1 is homogeneous of degree d. ■

With the previous lemma we have found the main characteristic that we need to find the bounds. We will get the results for a general field $\mathbb{K}$ since it could be interesting for other purposes, and then we will work on a special case of ideals of height 3 over an infinite field $\mathbb{F}$.

In the first part of this section we shall work in the polynomial ring $T = \mathbb{K}[s,t,u]$ and $J = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m)$ will denote a homogeneous ideal generated by m relatively prime polynomials

where each polynomial is bounded in total degree by d. Later we shall deal with the special case of an ideal $J = (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4) \in S(= \mathbb{F}[s,t,u])$ with $\deg(g_1) = \ldots = \deg(g_4)$ and $\mathrm{ht}(J) = 3$.

The following theorem contains the two fundamental bounds that we obtain in the first part of this section.

Theorem 13. *Let $J = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) \subset T$ be a homogeneous ideal, $\gcd(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) = 1$ and $\deg(f_1), \deg(f_2), \ldots, \deg(f_m) \leq d$. Then*

(i) The regularity of J is bounded by

$$reg(J) \leq 3d - 2.$$

(ii) The first Betti number of J can be bounded in terms of the second Betti number of J

$$\beta_1(J) \leq \beta_2(J) + m - 1.$$

(iii) The second Betti number of J is bounded by

$$\beta_2(J) \leq H_J(reg(J)) \leq H_J(3d-2) \leq \binom{3d}{2}.$$

In addition if $\deg(f_1) = \deg(f_2) = \ldots = \deg(f_m) = d$ then

$$\beta_2(J) \leq m\binom{2d}{2}.$$

(Where H_J denotes the Hilbert function.)

Now we shall prove that any ideal as J above has two relatively prime elements and so it will have grade bigger or equal than 2 ($\mathrm{grade}(I, R) \geq 2$), but in order to prove it we had to make a more complicated reformulation.

Lemma 14. *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be relatively prime polynomials ($\gcd(f_1, \ldots, f_m) = 1$), then there exists an infinite sequence of polynomials $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset (f_1, \ldots, f_m)$, with $\gcd(h_i, h_j) = 1$ for $i \neq j$.*

Proof. We shall proceed by making an induction argument on the number of polynomials m. For $m = 1$ we assume that the only polynomial in this case is equal to 1, so the ideal is whole polynomial ring and we can find such an infinite sequence (Euclid's proof for the infiniteness of primes is enough).

In the case $m > 1$, we compute $g = \gcd(f_1, \ldots, f_{m-1})$ and the new polynomials $f_1^{'} = f_1/g, \ldots, f_{m-1}^{'} = f_{m-1}/g$. Then, using that $\gcd(f_1^{'}, \ldots, f_{m-1}^{'}) = 1$ and the inductive hypothesis, we can obtain an

infinite sequence $\{h_i^{'}\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset (f_1^{'}, \ldots, f_{m-1}^{'})$ with $\gcd(h_i^{'}, h_j^{'}) = 1$ for $i \neq j$.

For each $h_i^{'}$ we have that $\gcd(f_m, f_m + gh_i^{'}) = \gcd(f_m, f_m + gh_i^{'} - f_m) = \gcd(f_m, gh_i^{'})$. From $\gcd(f_1, \ldots, f_m) = 1$ we conclude that $\gcd(f_m, g) = 1$ and for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we should have $\gcd(f_m, gh_j^{'}) = 1$, because all the $h_i^{'}$'s have different prime factors but f_m can have only a finite amount of prime factors.

Now we use another induction argument where the inductive step is similar to the previous paragraph. Suppose we have computed a sequence of polynomials $h_1, \ldots, h_k$ and a polynomial g_k, with the properties $\gcd(h_i, h_j) = 1$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ and $\gcd(h_i, g_k) = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Again, for each $h_i{'}$ we have

$$\gcd(h_1 \ldots h_k, h_1 \ldots h_k + g_k h_i^{'}) = \gcd(h_1 \ldots h_k, g_k h_i^{'}) = \gcd(h_1 \ldots h_k + g_k h_i^{'}, g_k h_i^{'}), \qquad (9)$$

and should exist some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\gcd(h_1 h_2 \ldots h_k, g_k h_j^{'}) = 1$. Thus we define the next elements in the inductive step as

$$h_{k+1} = h_1 h_2 \ldots h_k + g_k h_j^{'} \quad \text{and} \quad g_{k+1} = g_k h_j^{'}.$$

From (9) we have that $\gcd(h_1 h_2 \ldots h_k, h_{k+1}) = \gcd(h_1 h_2 \ldots h_k, g_{k+1}) = \gcd(h_{k+1}, g_{k+1}) = 1$, which implies $\gcd(h_i, h_j) = 1$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k+1$ and $\gcd(h_i, g_{k+1}) = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k+1$. Starting with $h_1 = f_m,\ g_1 = g$ and following this iteratively process we can construct the required sequence $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset (f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ with $\gcd(h_i, h_j) = 1$ for $i \neq j$. ■

Proposition 15. *Let $J = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) \subset T$ be a homogeneous ideal, where $\gcd(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) = 1$. Then grade$(J) \geq 2$.*

Proof. We choose two relatively prime elements p and q from the previous Lemma 14. Then p is regular on $\mathbb{K}[s,t,u]$, and q is regular on $\mathbb{K}[s,t,u]/p$ because $\gcd(p,q) = 1$. Therefore $\{p, q\}$ is a regular sequence and $\text{grade}(J) \geq 2$. ■

In [4], it is proven that for a general homogeneous ideal $I \subset \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ (in any characteristic) generated by homogeneous elements with degree $\leq d$, the regularity of I is bounded by

$$\text{reg}(I) \leq (2d)^{2^{n-2}}. \qquad (10)$$

Using similar ideas, in [16, Theorem 1.9.4] the bound $\text{reg}(\mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/I) \leq n(d-1)$ if $\dim(\mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/I) \leq 1$ is proven.

Proposition 16. *Let $J = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) \subset T$ be a homogeneous ideal, where $\gcd(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) = 1$ and $\deg(f_1), \deg(f_2), \ldots, \deg(f_m) \leq d$. Then the regularity is bounded by*

$$reg(J) \leq 3d - 2.$$

Proof. If we prove $\dim(T/J) \leq 1$, then we get the linear bound for the regularity $\operatorname{reg}(J) = \operatorname{reg}(T/J) + 1 \leq 3d - 2$.

Since T is a Cohen-Macaulay ring we obtain a lower bound for the height of J by means of $\operatorname{ht}(J) = \operatorname{grade}(J) \geq 2$. Finally, we have the general inequality

$$\operatorname{ht}(J) + \dim(T/J) \leq \dim(T) = 3,$$

that implies our desired inequality $\dim(T/J) \leq 1$. ∎

Remark 17. *From the definition of regularity we have that reg*$(J) \geq \min(\deg(f_1), \deg(f_2), \ldots, \deg(f_m))$. *So a linear bound for the regularity is optimal from a complexity point of view.*

Now we shall find a bound for the Betti numbers of J. Our main tool for this computation will be the Koszul complex.

Proposition 18. *Let $J = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) \subset T$ be a homogeneous ideal. Then*

$$\beta_{2,p}(J) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(Tor_2^T(J, \mathbb{K})_p) \leq H_J(p-2) - H_J(p-3).$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{x} = \{s, t, u\}$, we consider the Koszul complex $K(\mathbf{x}; J) = K(\mathbf{x}) \otimes_T J$

$$0 \to J \otimes_T \bigwedge^3 T(-3)^3 \xrightarrow{id \otimes_T d_3} J \otimes_T \bigwedge^2 T(-2)^3 \xrightarrow{id \otimes_T d_2} J \otimes_T \bigwedge^1 T(-1)^3 \xrightarrow{id \otimes_T d_1} J \otimes_T \bigwedge^0 T^3 \to 0.$$

We need to compute in the graded part $(J \otimes_T \bigwedge^2 T(-2)^3)_p = J_{p-2} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \bigwedge^3 \mathbb{K}^3$, so we only take the complex

$$0 \to J_{p-3} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \bigwedge^3 \mathbb{K}^3 \xrightarrow{(id \otimes_T d_3)_{p-3}} J_{p-2} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \bigwedge^2 \mathbb{K}^3 \xrightarrow{(id \otimes_T d_2)_{p-2}} J_{p-1} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \bigwedge^1 \mathbb{K}^3 \xrightarrow{(id \otimes_T d_1)_{p-1}} J_p \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \bigwedge^0 \mathbb{K}^3 \to 0,$$

which is made of $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces. Since $\mathbf{x} = \{s, t, u\}$ is a regular sequence, $K(\mathbf{x})$ is a free resolution for $\mathbb{K}$ and we get the formula

$$\operatorname{Tor}_2^T(J, \mathbb{K})_p \cong H_2 K(\mathbf{x}; J)_p = \frac{\operatorname{Ker}(id \otimes_T d_2)_p}{\operatorname{Im}(id \otimes_T d_3)_p} = \frac{\operatorname{Ker}((id \otimes_T d_2)_{p-2})}{\operatorname{Im}((id \otimes_T d_3)_{p-3})}.$$

Then using the fact that $\operatorname{Ker}((id \otimes_T d_2)_{p-2})$ and $\operatorname{Im}((id \otimes_T d_3)_{p-3})$ are $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces, we can compute the graded Betti number $\beta_{2,p}(J)$ with

$$\beta_{2,p}(J) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\operatorname{Ker}((id \otimes_T d_2)_{p-2})) - \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\operatorname{Im}((id \otimes_T d_3)_{p-3})).$$

From Corollary 7 we know that $\operatorname{pd}_T(J) \leq 2$, then we have that $H_3 K(\mathbf{x}; J) \cong \operatorname{Tor}_3^T(J, \mathbb{K}) = 0$ and so $\operatorname{Ker}(id \otimes_T d_3) = 0$. From this we conclude that $(id \otimes_T d_3)_{p-3}$ is an injective map and

$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathrm{Im}((id \otimes_T d_3)_{p-3})) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(J_{p-3} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \bigwedge^3 \mathbb{K}^3) = H_J(p-3)$.

Let $h_{12} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_1 \wedge e_2 + h_{13} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_1 \wedge e_3 + h_{23} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_2 \wedge e_3 \in \mathrm{Ker}((id \otimes_T d_2)_{p-2})$. By applying the differential map of the Koszul complex we have

$$sh_{12} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_2 - th_{12} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_1 + sh_{13} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_3 - uh_{13} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_1 + th_{23} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_3 - uh_{23} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} e_2 = 0.$$

From here we deduce the equations

$$\begin{aligned} th_{12} &= -uh_{13}, \\ sh_{12} &= uh_{23}, \\ sh_{13} &= -th_{23}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore one of the terms can completely define the other two, e.g., by knowing h_{12} we can determine h_{13} and h_{23}. This simple fact implies the inequality

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathrm{Ker}((id \otimes_T d_2)_{p-2})) \leq H_J(p-2),$$

and concludes the proof of the proposition. ■

Corollary 19. *Let $J = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) \subset T$ be a homogeneous ideal, with $\gcd(f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m) = 1$ and $\deg(f_1), \deg(f_2), \ldots, \deg(f_m) \leq d$. Then*

$$\beta_2(J) \leq H_J(reg(J)) \leq H_J(3d-2).$$

Proof. We have that $\beta_{2,p} = 0$ for $p > \mathrm{reg}(J) + 2$. Then we compute

$$\beta_2(J) = \sum_{p=1}^{\mathrm{reg}(J)+2} \beta_{2,p}(J) \leq \sum_{p=1}^{\mathrm{reg}(J)+2} (H_J(p-2) - H_J(p-3)) = H_J(\mathrm{reg}(J)) \leq H_J(3d-2).$$

■

Proof of Theorem 13. (i) The bound for the regularity has been already proved in Proposition 16.

(ii) The minimal free resolution of J has the form

$$0 \to T^{\beta_2(J)} \to T^{\beta_1(J)} \to T^{\beta_0(J)} \to J \to 0,$$

from the fact $\beta_0(J) \leq m$ and a simple computation with the Euler characteristic we get

$$\beta_1(J) \leq \beta_2(J) + m - 1.$$

(iii) We know that the number of monomials of degree d in $\mathbb{K}[s,t,u]$ is $\binom{d+2}{2}$, hence from

Corollary 19 we get the bound

$$\beta_2(J) \leq H_J(\mathrm{reg}(J)) \leq H_J(3d-2) \leq \binom{3d}{2}.$$

Now we add the extra condition that $J = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m)$ is generated by m polynomials of the same degree d. Hence for any $p \geq d$ we have that the $\mathbb{K}$-vector space J_p is generated by elements of the form gf_i $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ where g is a monomial of degree $p-d$. Therefore we have have that the Hilbert function of J is bounded by

$$H_J(p) \leq m\binom{p-d+2}{2},$$

and the second Betti number $\beta_2(J)$ has the bound

$$\beta_2(J) \leq m\binom{2d}{2}.$$

Hence we have completed the proof of Theorem 13 and also we see that it can be applied to the ideal $\hat{I}$ from the construction (5). ■

Now for the second part of this section we shall work with an ideal $J = (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4) \in S(= \mathbb{F}[s,t,u])$, such that $d = \deg(g_1) = \ldots = \deg(g_4)$ and $\mathrm{ht}(J) = 3$.

Theorem 20. *Let $J = (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4) \subset S$ be a homogeneous ideal with $d = \deg(g_1) = \ldots = \deg(g_4)$ and $ht(J) = 3$. Then*

$$\beta_1(J) \leq 2d+2,$$
$$\beta_2(J) \leq 2d-1.$$

Remark 21. *From the Unmixedness Theorem and the fact that $\mathbb{F}$ is an infinite field, we can find a complete intersection inside J (see* [18, Lemma A.10], [11, Theorem 125]*). Explicitly, there exist elements $h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4 \in J$ related to the original generators g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4 with the following sort of triangular transformation*

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 &= g_1 + \alpha_{12}g_2 + \alpha_{13}g_3 + \alpha_{14}g_4, \\ h_2 &= g_2 + \alpha_{23}g_3 + \alpha_{24}g_4, \\ h_3 &= g_3 + \alpha_{34}g_4, \\ h_4 &= g_4, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$ is a complete intersection and $\alpha_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}$. Therefore we can assume that $J = (h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4)$, where $\{h_1, h_2, h_3\}$ is a complete intersection and $d = \deg(h_1) = \ldots = \deg(h_4)$.

Also we can suppose that $h_4 \notin (h_1, h_2, h_3)$, because in case $J = (h_1, h_2, h_3)$ then the minimal free resolution of S/J can be obtained with the Koszul complex, that trivially satisfies the result of Theorem 20. In general, an ideal of grade g and minimally generated by $g+1$ elements is said to be an almost complete intersection.

We shall take a similar approach to [14] using a process of linkage or liaison. By making the observation that $J = (h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4)$ can be linked to a Gorenstein ideal G (see [13, Corollary 5.19], [2, Proposition 5.2]) via the complete intersection $K = (h_1, h_2, h_3)$, i.e., $G = (K : J)$.

The minimal free resolution of S/K is given by the Koszul complex, in our case we can explicitly write

$$0 \to S(-3d) \xrightarrow{d_3} S(-2d)^3 \xrightarrow{d_2} S(-d)^3 \xrightarrow{d_1} S \to S/K \to 0.$$

Using Buchsbaum and Eisenbud's structure theorem for height 3 Gorenstein ideals [2, Theorem 2.1], the minimal free resolution of S/G has the form

$$0 \to S(-s-3) \xrightarrow{g^*} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} S(-p_i) \xrightarrow{f} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} S(-q_i) \xrightarrow{g} S \to S/G \to 0,$$

where s is the socle degree of G (the largest k such that $(S/G)_k \neq 0$), m is odd, f is alternating, and $G = \mathrm{Pf}_{n-1}(f)$ (the ideal generated by the $(n-1)$-th Pfaffians of f). If we write g_i and f_{ij} for the forms which are the entries of the matrices of g and f, then

$$q_i = \deg(g_i), \qquad p_j = q_i + \deg(f_{ij}), \qquad s + 3 = p_i + q_i.$$

Lemma 22. *The socle degree of S/G is $2d-3$.*

Proof. Since K is a complete intersection we know that the socle degree of S/K is $3d-3$. We have that the Hilbert function of a Gorenstein algebra is symmetric, also we can relate the Hilbert functions of S/K, S/G and S/J [10, Theorem 2.10, page 308] in the following way

$$H_{S/K}(t) = H_{S/J}(t) + H_{S/G}(3d-3-t).$$

By symmetry of $H_{S/K}(t)$ we can rewrite it as

$$H_{S/G}(t) = H_{S/K}(3d-3-t) - H_{S/J}(3d-3-t),$$

then for any $t > 2d-3$ we have $3d-3-t < d$ and $H_{S/J}(3d-3-t) = H_{S/K}(3d-3-t) = \binom{3d-1-t}{2}$, also we can easily check that $H_{S/G}(2d-3) = 1$. ∎

Proof of Theorem 20. We substitute the socle degree of S/G in its minimal free resolution, and from the canonical map $S/K \to S/G$ we can lift a comparison map

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & S(-3d) & \xrightarrow{d_3} & S(-2d)^3 & \xrightarrow{d_2} & S(-d)^3 & \xrightarrow{d_1} & S & \longrightarrow & S/K & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_3} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_0 = id} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle can} & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & S(-2d) & \xrightarrow{g^*} & \bigoplus_{i=1}^m S(-p_i) & \xrightarrow{f} & \bigoplus_{i=1}^m S(-q_i) & \xrightarrow{g} & S & \longrightarrow & S/G & \longrightarrow & 0.
\end{array}$$

With a dual mapping cone construction ([2], [14]) we can obtain the following free resolution for S/J (not necessarily minimal)

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} S(-3d+q_i) \to \begin{array}{c} S(-2d)^3 \\ \bigoplus \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^m S(-3d+p_i) \end{array} \to S(-d)^4 \to S \to S/J \to 0.$$

Thus have $\beta_2(J) \leq m$ and $\beta_1(J) \leq m+3$, and to finish the proof of the theorem we only have to find an upper bound for the minimal number of generators $m = \mu(G)$ of the height 3 Gorenstein ideal G.

For this task we use the result of [8, Theorem 3.3], which states that given the smallest degree k of the generators of G (i.e., k is the first position in which $H_{S/G}(k) < \binom{k+2}{2}$) then $m = \mu(G) \leq 2k+1$.

Since the Hilbert function of S/G is symmetric we have $H_{S/G}(d-2) = H_{S/G}(d-1)$, and so $k \leq d-1$ because otherwise we get the contradiction $\binom{d}{2} = \binom{d+1}{2}$. Finally, we have obtained $\beta_2(J) \leq 2d-1$ and $\beta_1(J) \leq 2d+2$. ■

Remark 23. *An interesting fact proved in* [14, Corollary 4.4]*, is that when the ideal* $J = (g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4)$ *is a general Artinian almost complete intersection of type* (d, d, d, d)*, then the minimal free resolution can be given explicitly. This means that* J *is generated by "generically chosen" polynomials* g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4*, where* (g_1, g_2, g_3) *are a complete intersection,* $g_4 \notin (g_1, g_2, g_3)$*, and* $d = \deg(g_1) = \ldots = \deg(g_4)$*. The minimal free resolution of* S/J *in this case is*

$$0 \to S(-2d-1)^d \to \begin{array}{c} S(-2d)^3 \\ \bigoplus \\ S(-2d+1)^d \end{array} \to S(-d)^4 \to S \to S/J \to 0.$$

The term "generically chosen" means that g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4 *belong to a suitable dense open subset of* $S_d \times S_d \times S_d \times S_d$ *in the Zariski topology.*

5 Projective dimension one

Now we go back to our original problem, which we are going to solve in the case $\mathrm{pd}(\hat{I}) = 1$. We recall from (7) that in this case, the resolution of $\hat{I}$ is of the form

$$0 \to S(-\alpha_1) \oplus S(-\alpha_2) \oplus S(-\alpha_3) \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{p_1} & \hat{q_1} & \hat{r_1} \\ \hat{p_2} & \hat{q_2} & \hat{r_2} \\ \hat{p_3} & \hat{q_3} & \hat{r_3} \\ \hat{p_4} & \hat{q_4} & \hat{r_4} \end{pmatrix}} S(-d)^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0. \qquad (11)$$

This case where $\mathrm{Syz}(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$ is a free S-module was studied in [6], and it is called **strong μ-basis**. More formally, for a mapping

$$\phi : \mathbb{P}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^3,$$

which is given by homogeneous polynomials $b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 \in S$ of the same degree d, if we assume that $\mathrm{Syz}(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$ is a graded free S-module, then we get the exact sequence

$$0 \to S(-d-\mu_1) \oplus S(-d-\mu_2) \oplus S(-d-\mu_3) \to S(-d)^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} S \to S/(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \to 0,$$

where $\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3 = d$. In this situation $\mathrm{Syz}(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$ is called a *strong μ-basis* of type (μ_1, μ_2, μ_3) for ϕ.

Using this previous result from [6] we get that (11) is of the form

$$0 \to S(-d-\mu_1) \oplus S(-d-\mu_2) \oplus S(-d-\mu_3) \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{p_1} & \hat{q_1} & \hat{r_1} \\ \hat{p_2} & \hat{q_2} & \hat{r_2} \\ \hat{p_3} & \hat{q_3} & \hat{r_3} \\ \hat{p_4} & \hat{q_4} & \hat{r_4} \end{pmatrix}} S(-d)^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0,$$

with $\mu_1 + \mu_2 + \mu_3 = d$.

From the inequalities $d + \mu_1, d + \mu_2, d + \mu_3 \leq 2d$ and the fact that in the previous resolution the graded free module $S(-d)^4$ has all its grading exactly in d, we deduce that the degree of the polynomials $\hat{p_i}, \hat{q_i}, \hat{r_i}$ is bounded by $d = 2d - d$. Therefore we have obtained the following result:

Theorem 24. *Given the data $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ defining the (1), with $d = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 4}(\deg(a_i))$ and $\gcd(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = 1$. If $pd_S(\hat{I}) = 1$ ($\hat{I}$ is the ideal obtained in (5)), then there exists a basis for Syz(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) (a μ-basis for the rational surface defined by $P(s,t) = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$) with*

polynomials bounded in degree by d.

6 Projective dimension two

In this section we deal with the more complicated case $\operatorname{pd}(\hat{I}) = 2$. Here we will need the bound for the regularity

$$\operatorname{reg}(\hat{I}) \leq 3d - 2,$$

and also the bound for the second Betti number

$$\beta_2(\hat{I}) \leq 4\binom{2d}{2}.$$

We recall from (8) that in this case the resolution for $\hat{I}$ is of the form

$$0 \to S^a \xrightarrow{\hat{d_2}} S^{a+3} \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1}} S^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0, \tag{12}$$

and now we want to compute what a is. Here we are using an abuse of notation, because we should write

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{i=1}^{a} S(-p_i) \xrightarrow{\hat{d_2}} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{a+3} S(-q_i) \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1}} S(-d)^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0, \tag{13}$$

if we want to take care of the grading.

In (12) we don't know if b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 is a minimal system of generators. But we can guarantee that in the next step of finding a resolution, we will find a minimal system of generators for $\operatorname{Syz}(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)$, then from [15, Theorem 7.3] we have that $\operatorname{Im}(\hat{d_2}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}S^{a+3}$ where $\mathfrak{m} = (s, t, u)$ is the irrelevant ideal.

Using that $\operatorname{Im}(\hat{d_2}) \subset \mathfrak{m}S^{a+3}$ we can *"adapt"* the bounds obtained in the previous section to (12). A key issue is that for a free module $F = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} S(-\alpha_i)$ we have $(F \otimes_S \mathbb{F})_p = 0$ if and only if $p \neq \alpha_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Lemma 25. *For the resolution (12) (more specifically (13)) we have that*

(i) $\max_{1 \leq i \leq a+3}(q_i) \leq 3d - 1$,

(ii) $\max_{1 \leq i \leq a}(p_i) \leq 3d$,

(iii) $a = \beta_2(\hat{I})$.

Proof. (i) Let $p > 3d - 2 + 1 = 3d - 1$ then from $\operatorname{reg}(\hat{I}) \leq 3d - 2$ we have that $\beta_{1,p} = 0$, and in this case implies that

$$\operatorname{Ker}((\hat{d_1} \otimes_S \mathbb{F})_p) = \operatorname{Tor}_1^S(\hat{I}, \mathbb{F})_p = 0$$

because $\mathrm{Im}(\hat{d_2} \otimes_S \mathbb{F}) = 0$.

Hence we may conclude that $(\hat{d_1} \otimes_S \mathbb{F})_p$ is an injective map, and

$$\left(\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{a+3} S(-q_i) \right) \bigotimes_S \mathbb{F} \right)_p = 0$$

because $(S(-d)^4 \otimes_S \mathbb{F})_q = 0$ for $q > d$. Therefore we have the inequality $\max_{1 \leq i \leq a+3}(q_i) \leq 3d-1$.

(ii), (iii) Deleting $\hat{I}$ from (12) and applying the tensor product $\otimes_S \mathbb{F}$ we get the complex

$$0 \to \mathbb{F}^a \xrightarrow{0} \mathbb{F}^{a+3} \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1} \otimes_S F} \mathbb{F}^4 \to 0.$$

So $a = \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(\mathrm{Tor}_2^S(\hat{I}, \mathbb{F})) = \beta_2(\hat{I})$, and the grading of the module S^a is just like the one for a minimal free resolution, i.e. $\leq (3d-2)+2 = 3d$. ■

So in this case the resolution of $\hat{I}$ is of the form

$$0 \to S^{\beta_2(\hat{I})} \xrightarrow{\hat{d_2}} S^{\beta_2(\hat{I})+3} \xrightarrow{\hat{d_1}} S^4 \xrightarrow{[b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4]} \hat{I} \to 0,$$

where the polynomials in the entries of the matrices $\hat{d_1}$ and $\hat{d_2}$ have degree bounded by $3d-1-d = 2d-1$, and $3d-d = 2d$ respectively.

Now finally, we can return to our original problem in $R = \mathbb{F}[s,t]$. We apply the tensor product with $\otimes_S S/(u-1)$ to obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \to R^{\beta_2(\hat{I})} \xrightarrow{d_2} R^{\beta_2(\hat{I})+3} \xrightarrow{d_1} R^4 \xrightarrow{[a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4]} I \to 0,$$

where $d_1 = \hat{d_1} \otimes_S S/(u-1)$ and $d_2 = \hat{d_2} \otimes_S S/(u-1)$ are matrices with entries in R bounded in degree by $2d-1$ and $2d$ respectively.

For the rest of this section we shall work with the exact sequence

$$0 \to R^{\beta_2(\hat{I})} \xrightarrow{d_2} R^{\beta_2(\hat{I})+3} \xrightarrow{d_1} \mathrm{Syz}(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4)\ (\subset R^4) \to 0, \tag{14}$$

which is a split exact sequence because we know that $\mathrm{Syz}(a_1,a_2,a_3,a_4)$ is a free module.

In general a module that satisfies a split exact sequence like the previous is called *stably free*. The question of whether *"every finitely generated projective module over a polynomial ring is a free module"*, was an open problem known as the *"Serre's conjecture"* until Daniel Quillen and Andrei Suslin independently proved it in 1976. Actually, what Suslin proved was that every stably free module over a polynomial ring is free, because previously Serre himself had proven that every finitely generated projective module over a polynomial ring is stably free (see [12] for

an excellent exposition both mathematical and historical).

Here we are in a position where the only thing that we "know" is the split exact sequence (14) (for the only thing we have bounds is for the matrices d_1 and d_2) and we want to find a bound for a basis of $\mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$. For this task, we will follow the paper [3], where there is an algorithmic proof based on the original Suslin's proof for the Serre's conjecture.

An $m \times n$ ($m > n$) polynomial matrix $A \in R^{m\times n}$ is said to be *unimodular* if it satisfies one the following equivalent conditions (see [12])

(i) A can be completed into an invertible $m \times m$ square matrix.

(ii) there exists an $n \times m$ polynomial matrix $B \in R^{n\times m}$ such that $AB = I_m$.

(iii) there exists an $n \times m$ polynomial matrix $B \in R^{n\times m}$ such that $BA = I_n$.

(iv) the ideal generated by the $n \times n$ minors of A is equal to R.

We define the degree of a matrix $M = (a_{ij}) \in R^{m\times n}$ as the maximum degree of the polynomial entries of M, i.e., $\deg(M) = \max(\deg(a_{ij}))$. For an *"effective"* solution of completing a unimodular matrix we are going to use the following result from [3].

Theorem 26. *Let $R = \mathbb{F}[s,t]$ and assume that $F \in R^{m\times n}$ ($m < n$) is unimodular. Then there exists a square matrix $M \in R^{n\times n}$ such that*

(i) M is unimodular,

(ii) $FM = [I_m, 0] \in R^{m\times n}$,

(iii) $\deg(M) \leq 2D(1+2D)(1+D^4)(1+D)^4$, where $D = m(1+\deg(F))$.

Proof. See the Appendix for a discussion. ■

This previous result is given for completing rows (i.e., $m < n$), but we want to complete columns (i.e., $m > n$). By simply taking transpose in (ii) of the previous theorem we get the following corollary.

Corollary 27. *Let $R = \mathbb{F}[s,t]$ and assume that $F \in R^{m\times n}$ ($m > n$) is unimodular. Then there exists a square matrix $M \in R^{m\times m}$ such that*

(i) M is unimodular,

(ii) $MF = \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \in R^{m\times n}$,

(iii) $\deg(M) \leq 2D(1+2D)(1+D^4)(1+D)^4$, where $D = n(1+\deg(F))$.

For notational purposes we make the following conventions

- we shall use just β_2 instead of $\beta_2(\hat{I})$,
- $m = \beta_2 + 3$ and $n = \beta_2$,
- d_2 denotes the $m \times n$ matrix $F \in R^{m\times n}$ with $\gamma_2 = \deg(F)$,
- d_1 denotes the $4 \times m$ matrix $G \in R^{4\times m}$ with $\gamma_1 = \deg(G)$,
- $D = n(1 + \deg(F)) = \beta_2(1 + \gamma_2)$,

thus we end up with

$$0 \to R^n \xrightarrow{F} R^m \xrightarrow{G} \mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)\ (\subset R^4) \to 0. \tag{15}$$

Since this sequence splits, there exists a matrix $H \in R^{n\times m}$ with $HF = I_n$ and so the matrix F is unimodular.

In the split exact sequence (15) we know that there exists an R-module $V \cong \mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$, such that R^m is the direct sum of $\mathrm{Im}(F)$ and V, that is

$$R^m = \mathrm{Im}(F) \oplus V. \tag{16}$$

Making a more careful treatment we can find that

$$\mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = \mathrm{Im}(G) = G(V),$$

because $\mathrm{Ker}(G) = \mathrm{Im}(F)$. Finally we are ready to find a bound for the degrees in a basis of $\mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$.

Proposition 28. *From the exact sequence (15) we can get a basis for Syz(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) made of three vectors $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{r} \in R^4$, with*

$$\begin{aligned}\max(\deg(\mathbf{p}), \deg(\mathbf{q}), \deg(\mathbf{r})) &\leq \gamma_1(\beta_2 + 2)2D(1 + 2D)(1 + D^4)(1 + D)^4 \\ &\leq 2\gamma_1(\beta_2 + 2)\beta_2(1 + \gamma_2)(1 + 2\beta_2(1 + \gamma_2))(1 + (\beta_2(1 + \gamma_2))^4)(1 + \beta_2(1 + \gamma_2))^4.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We can get a matrix $M \in R^{m\times m}$ that satisfies *(i), (ii), (iii)* from Corollary 27. Let $N \in R^{m\times m}$ be the inverse matrix of M, then we have that

$$\deg(N) \leq (m - 1)\deg(M), \tag{17}$$

because the determinant of every $(m - 1) \times (m - 1)$-minor is a polynomial of degree at most

$m-1$ in terms of the entries of M. Also, from the item (ii) of Corollary 27 we have that

$$F = N \begin{bmatrix} I_n \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We know that N is an automorphism for $R^m = N(span(e_1, \ldots, e_n, e_{n+1}, e_{n+2}, e_{n+3}))$ and that

$$\mathrm{Ker}(G) = \mathrm{Im}(F) = N(span(e_1, \ldots, e_n)),$$

where e_i is the i-th column vector of R^m. Hence we have

$$\mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = \mathrm{Im}(G) = G(R^m) = GN(span(e_1, \ldots, e_m)) = GN(span(e_{n+1}, e_{n+2}, e_{n+3})),$$

and we define the basis for $\mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p} &= GNe_{n+1}, \\ \mathbf{q} &= GNe_{n+2}, \\ \mathbf{r} &= GNe_{n+3}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the previous bound (17), we obtain the result

$$\begin{aligned} \max(\deg(\mathbf{p}), \deg(\mathbf{q}), \deg(\mathbf{r})) &\leq \deg(G)\deg(N) \leq \gamma_1(\beta_2+2)2D(1+2D)(1+D^4)(1+D)^4 \\ &\leq 2\gamma_1(\beta_2+2)\beta_2(1+\gamma_2)(1+2\beta_2(1+\gamma_2))(1+(\beta_2(1+\gamma_2))^4)(1+\beta_2(1+\gamma_2))^4. \end{aligned}$$

■

In the previous proposition we have proven that with an exact sequence like (15) we can always find a basis for $\mathrm{Syz}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$. The following theorem contains the main result of this paper, and gives different bounds for the generators of the basis depending on the type of exact sequence (15) that we can obtain.

Theorem 29. *Given the data* $\{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\}$ *defining (1), with* $d = \max_{1\leq i\leq 4}(\deg(a_i))$ *and* $\gcd(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = 1$. *Then*

(i) There exists a basis for Syz(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) *with polynomials bounded in the order of* $O(d^{33})$.

(ii) Under the additional condition that the homogenized ideal $\hat{I}$ *(obtained in (5)) has height* $ht(\hat{I}) = 3$, *then we can find a basis with bound in the order of* $O(d^{22})$.

(iii) When the homogenized ideal $\hat{I}$ *is a "general" almost complete intersection (i.e, like in Remark 23), then there exists a basis bounded by* $O(d^{12})$.

Proof. (i) By Lemma 25 we know that $\gamma_1 = \deg(G) \leq 2d-1$ and $\gamma_2 = \deg(F) \leq 2d$, from Theorem 13 we have $\beta_2 \leq 4\binom{2d}{2} \in O(d^2)$. Therefore substituting in the formula obtained in Proposition 28 we get a basis bounded by $O(d^{33})$.

(ii) In this case from Theorem 20 we have $\beta_2 \leq 2d-1$. So we can reduce the bound to $O(d^{22})$.

(iii) In Remark 23 we saw that when $\hat{I}$ is a general almost complete intersection then $S/\hat{I}$ has a very special minimal free resolution, from which we can obtain $\gamma_1 = \deg(G) = d$, $\gamma_2 = \deg(F) = 2$ and $\beta_2 = d$. Therefore we obtain a bound in the order of $O(d^{12})$. ■

7 Example

In this section shall compute a μ-basis for the surface defined in Example 11. The aim is to show some computational aspects of the more complicated case studied in this paper (i.e., $\mathrm{pd}(\hat{I}) = 2$).

Example 30. *Find a μ-basis for the rational surface*

$$P(s,t) = (s^2, t^2, s^2-1, s^2+1).$$

Proof. Here the homogenized ideal of the construction (5) is $\hat{I} = (s^2, t^2, s^2-u^2, s^2+u^2)$ and from Example 11 we remember that it has the following free resolution

$$0 \to S \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s^2 \\ -u^2 \\ -t^2 \end{pmatrix}} S^4 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -2 & -t^2 & -t^2 & u^2-s^2 \\ 0 & u^2 & s^2 & 0 \\ 1 & t^2 & 0 & s^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} S^4 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} s^2 & t^2 & s^2-u^2 & s^2+u^2 \end{pmatrix}} \hat{I} \to 0.$$

Substituting $u = 1$ and cutting the resolution for $\mathrm{Syz}(s^2, t^2, s^2-1, s^2+1)$, we obtain the short exact sequence

$$0 \to R \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s^2 \\ -1 \\ -t^2 \end{pmatrix}} R^4 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -2 & -t^2 & -t^2 & 1-s^2 \\ 0 & 1 & s^2 & 0 \\ 1 & t^2 & 0 & s^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} \mathrm{Syz}(s^2, t^2, s^2-1, s^2+1) \ (\subset R^4) \to 0.$$

Proceeding with the method given in Proposition 28, we have to complete the unimodular column $(0, s^2, -1, -t^2)^t$ into an invertible matrix $N \in R^{4\times 4}$. For this we can check that the following

matrix

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ s^2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ t^2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

has determinant 1.

Therefore, a μ-basis for $P(s,t) = (s^2, t^2, s^2-1, s^2+1)$ is given by the vectors

$$\mathbf{p} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & -t^2 & -t^2 & 1-s^2 \\ 0 & 1 & s^2 & 0 \\ 1 & t^2 & 0 & s^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ s^2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ t^2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -t^2 \\ 1 \\ t^2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{q} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & -t^2 & -t^2 & 1-s^2 \\ 0 & 1 & s^2 & 0 \\ 1 & t^2 & 0 & s^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ s^2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ t^2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{r} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & -t^2 & -t^2 & 1-s^2 \\ 0 & 1 & s^2 & 0 \\ 1 & t^2 & 0 & s^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ s^2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ t^2 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-s^2 \\ 0 \\ s^2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

■

Appendix

In this appendix we will discuss the "effective" completion of unimodular matrices that we used in Proposition 28. The main result we shall follow from [3] is the following theorem.

Theorem 31. [3, Theorem 3.1] *Let $R = \mathbb{F}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and assume that $F \in R^{r\times s}$ $(r < s)$ is unimodular. Then there exists a square matrix $M \in R^{s\times s}$ such that*

(i) M is unimodular,

(ii) $FM = [I_r, 0] \in R^{r\times s}$,

(iii) $\deg(M) = (r(1+\deg(F))^{O(n)}$.

In our case $n = 2$ and we will have to make some small *"adjustments"* to find an actual constant. We will follow exactly the same proof as in [3], and in certain steps we will substitute phrases like $n + 3n \in O(n)$ by the exact computation $n + 3n = 4n$.

Proposition 32. [3, Proposition 4.1] *Assume that $F \in R^{r\times s}$ ($R = \mathbb{F}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, $r < s$) is unimodular. Then there exists a square matrix $M \in R^{s\times s}$ such that:*

(i) M is unimodular,

(ii) $FM = [f_{ij}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}, 0)]$ (i.e., FM is equal to the $r \times s$ matrix obtained by specializing the indeterminate x_n to zero in the matrix F),

(iii) $\deg(M) \leq D(1 + 2D)(1 + D^{2n})(1 + D)^{2n}$, with $D = r(1 + \deg(F))$.

Proof. We denote $F(t)$ as the matrix $F(t) = [f_{ij}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}, t)]$ and inside this proposition $d = 1 + \deg(F)$.

Claim 1. [3, Procedure 4.6, Step 1 and Step 2] There exists elements $c_1, \ldots, c_N \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$ with $N \leq (1 + rd)^{2n}$ such that $x_n \in (c_1, \ldots, c_N)$. Also we can find elements $a_1, \ldots, a_N \in x_n\mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$, such that

$$x_n = a_1c_1 + \ldots + a_Nc_N$$

and with

$$\max_{1\leq k\leq N}\{\deg(a_kc_k)\} \leq 1 + (rd)^{2n}.$$

Claim 2. [3, Procedure 4.6, Step 3 and Step 4] For $1 \leq k \leq N$ let

$$b_k = \sum_{h=1}^{k} a_hc_h,$$

then there exist unimodular matrices E_k with the properties

- $F(b_k)E_k = F(b_{k-1})$,
- $\deg(E_k) \leq rd(1 + 2rd)\max\{\deg(b_k), \deg(b_{k-1})\} \leq rd(1 + 2rd)(1 + (rd)^{2n})$ (here we substituted the original $(rd)^{O(n)}$ by obtained bound, because $\max\{\deg(b_k), \deg(b_{k-1})\} \leq 1 + (rd)^{2n}$).

Therefore we define $M = E_NE_{N-1} \ldots E_1$ and we have $F(x_n)M = F(0)$, with the bound

$$\deg(M) \leq Nrd(1 + 2rd)(1 + (rd)^{2n}) \leq rd(1 + 2rd)(1 + (rd)^{2n})(1 + rd)^{2n}.$$
$$\deg(M) \leq D(1 + 2D)(1 + D^{2n})(1 + D)^{2n}$$

■

Proof of Theorem 31. For a matrix $F = [f_{ij}(x_1, \ldots, x_n)]$ the substitution of a variable x_i for 0 does not increase the degree of the matrix, and keeps the unimodularity because the condition of being unimodular is equivalent to the fact that the $(r \times r)$-minors generate R. Therefore,

applying the previous proposition n times we can find a unimodular square $R^{s\times s}$ matrix $M^{'}$ with

$$FM^{'} = [f_{ij}(0,0,\ldots,0)]$$

and degree bounded by

$$\deg(M^{'}) \leq nD(1+2D)(1+D^{2n})(1+D)^{2n}.$$

Since the matrix $[f_{ij}(0,0,\ldots,0)]$ has rank r, we can find an elementary matrix $E \in \mathbb{F}^{s\times s}$ with $[f_{ij}(0,0,\ldots,0)]E = [I_r, 0]$. Making $M = M^{'}E$, we get $FM = [I_r, 0]$ and the same inequality

$$\deg(M) \leq nD(1+2D)(1+D^{2n})(1+D)^{2n}.$$

■

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to the support and guidance of Lothar Göttsche as his thesis supervisor in the Postgraduate Diploma in Mathematics of ICTP, where a big part of this project was developed. The author expresses his gratitude to his current PhD supervisor in the University of Barcelona, Carlos D'Andrea, for suggesting the problem, for a thorough reading of earlier drafts, and for his important help in the culmination of the paper. The author thanks Laurent Busé, Alicia Dickenstein, Rosa Maria Miró-Roig, Pablo Solernó and Martin Sombra for helpful discussions and suggestions. The author thanks David Cox for pointing out his previous work [6]. The author was funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 675789.

References

[1] Winfried Bruns, H. Jürgen Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, 2nd ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[2] David A Buchsbaum, David Eisenbud, *Algebra structures for finite free resolutions, and some structure theorems for ideals of codimension 3*, American Journal of Mathematics **99** (1977), no. 3, 447–485.

[3] Leandro Caniglia, Guillermo Cortiñas, Silvia Danón, Joos Heintz, Teresa Krick, Pablo Solernó, *Algorithmic aspects of Suslin's proof of Serre's conjecture*, Computational Complexity **3** (1993), no. 1, 31–55.

[4] Giulio Caviglia, Enrico Sbarra, *Characteristic-free bounds for the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity*, Compos. Math **141** (2005), no. 6, 1365–1373.

[5] Falai Chen, David Cox, Yang Liu, *The μ-basis and implicitization of a rational parametric surface*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **39** (2005), no. 6, 689–706.

[6] David Cox, *Equations of parametric curves and surfaces via syzygies*, Contemp. Math **286** (2001), 1-20.

[7] Wolfram Decker, Gert-Martin Greuel, Gerhard Pfister, Hans Schönemann, SINGULAR *4-0-2 — A computer algebra system for polynomial computations*, 2015. `http://www.singular.uni-kl.de`.

[8] Susan Diesel, *Irreducibility and dimension theorems for families of height 3 Gorenstein algebras*, Pacific J. Math **172** (1996), no. 2, 365–397.

[9] David Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra with a view towards Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 150, Springer-Verlag, 1995.

[10] Juan Elias, JM Giral, Rosa M Miró-Roig, Santiago Zarzuela, *Six lectures on commutative algebra*, Springer, 2010.

[11] Irving Kaplansky, *Commutative rings*, Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

[12] T. Y. Lam, *Serre's problem on projective modules*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer Verlag, 2006.

[13] U. Nagel J. Migliore, *Liaison and Related Topics: Notes from the Torino Workshop/School* (2002). arXiv:math/0205161.

[14] Juan Migliore, Rosa M Miró-Roig, *On the minimal free resolution of $n+1$ general forms*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **355** (2003), no. 1, 1–36.

[15] Irena Peeva, *Graded syzygies*, Vol. 14, Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.

[16] ———, *Syzygies and Hilbert functions*, CRC Press, 2007.

[17] Joseph J. Rotman, *An introduction to homological algebra*, Academic Press, 1979.

[18] Agnes Szanto, *Solving over-determined systems by the subresultant method (with an appendix by Marc Chardin)*, Vol. 43, Elsevier, 2008.